DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 168 CS 504 949

AUTHOR Kinzer, Harold J.
TITLE Video Feedback in the Classroom: Possible Consequences for the Communication Apprehensive.
PUB DATE 17 Feb 85
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Fresno, CA, February 16-19, 1985).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Anxiety; Attitude Change; Behavior Patterns; *Communication Apprehension; Communication Research; *Feedback; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Self Concept; *Speech Communication; *Student Reaction; *Videotape Recordings

ABSTRACT

Although the use of video playback of classroom assignments for students who are communication apprehensive, shy, or unassertive has received widespread adoption, a review of the literature suggests that its use is potentially harmful. Typically, those with high anxiety about communication are characterized by excessive fear of evaluation, irrational beliefs about being the focus of attention, low self-esteem, negative expectations of success, inability to accept success evaluation, tendency to negatively interpret their own actions, and unwillingness/inability to self-disclose. Video feedback focuses attention on self and magnifies communication performance difficulties and so might increase fear of communication, reinforce negative self-perceptions, and further reduce self-esteem and expectations of success in communication. Stress reactions to video feedback have been found in a few studies. Research has also shown some practices of video feedback to be successful, such as the use of self-modeling, using video models of others, preparing the students for videotaping, focusing feedback, and using several videotaped exercises to reduce novelty effects. The report includes a substantive bibliography. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED257168

VIDEO FEEDBACK IN THE CLASSROOM:

POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE COMMUNICATION APPREHENSIVE

Harold J. Kinzer

Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Western Speech Communication Association Convention

Fresno

February 17, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Harold J. Kinzer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 949

Video Feedback in the Classroom:

Possible Consequences for the Communication Apprehensive

Abstract

Research reviewed here suggests that use of video playback of classroom assignments is potentially harmful to those students who are communication apprehensive, shy, or unassertive. Typically, those with high anxiety about communication are characterized by excessive fear of evaluation, irrational beliefs about being the focus of attention, low self-esteem, negative expectations of success, inability to accept success evaluation, tendency to negatively interpret own actions, and unwillingness/inability to self-disclose. Video feedback focuses attention on self and magnifies communication performance difficulties so might increase fear of communication, reinforce negative self-perceptions, and further reduce self-esteem and expectations of success in communication. Stress reactions to video feedback have been found in a few studies. Research implications and guidelines for video feedback with the high anxious are suggested.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Learning research has demonstrated that a certain level of arousal is necessary for learning; excessive arousal can inhibit learning (Hulse, Deese, & Egeth, 1975; Krohne & Laux, 1982). The video and/or verbal feedback we typically employ in communication classrooms generates arousal as well as provides necessary performance feedback and evaluation required for learning and skill development. Generally, research suggests that for most students feedback increases satisfaction with instruction, increases interest, and facilitates learning (Joyce & Weil, 1980; Wittrock & Lumsdaine, 1977). However, for some students feedback--especially feedback perceived to be evaluative--generates excessive anxiety which interferes with learning and with desire to continue instruction (Krohne & Laux, 1982).

A growing body of research suggests that a significant number of people experience debilitating anxiety about social interaction and/or specific communication situations (see Daly & McCroskey, 1984, for review of research). Although many will avoid our classes, a number are likely to be enrolled in our basic courses. The nature of required communication performances, the type of experienced anxiety, and the nature of instruction and evaluation could determine whether we help or hurt these social-communicative anxious students.

Some of us try to help the anxious student with either informal in-class attention or formal programs designed to reduce anxiety and develop communication skills. Many, or possibly most, of us do not or can not provide this attention. A national survey found that only 6.8% of responding departments offered special programs for the social-communicative anxious (Hoffmann and Sprague, 1982). This finding suggests that, in spite of the research

attention, the problems of the anxious minority in our classes appear to receive little attention. This apparent inattention might lead us to employ teaching and evaluation methods which are aversive or even harmful to these students. Although it is generally agreed that the anxious are less successful with classroom communication assignments and that anxiety treatment should occur in an evaluation-free environment, there is less attention to the consequences of "mainstreaming" these students in our classes. Foss concluded an examination of treatment programs with an expression of concern "that highly anxious students may be hurt rather than helped by required oral presentations, the assignment of grades for class participation, and the like" (1982, p. 200).

These anxious students have little expectation of success and find that the attention focused on them and their performance is aversive so are likely to find that communication assignments reinforce or even intensify anxiety. Although largely unexamined in the speech communication education literature, it is possible that some uses of verbal and video feedback prompt deleterious intensification of anxiety. Video feedback is likely to be especially risky because it is self-confrontational.

Of the various instructional/evaluational methods which might be harmful to the unprepared high anxious student, this paper will focus on video feedback because of its enthusiastic and widespread adoption. The high anxious student might have difficulty avoiding it because it is used in education, business, psychology, parenting, engineering, as well as in communication classes. We need to examine the limited research to determine whether a concern about video feedback as an intensifier of anxiety is warranted. Much of the research to be examined here is only indirectly relevant so we need more research which directly seeks to identify how the anxious respond to feedback in our classes. In addition to tentative conclusions about how the anxious might respond to feedback, an attempt will

be made to suggest to the teacher some possible ways of offering feedback to both the high and low anxious students.

Not all of the feedback effects are likely to be negative. For example, Phillips (1984) probably would argue that properly used video feedback should help many students by showing them that they are making skill improvements. In addition, it is also likely that some uses of video could even help to reduce the anxiety of the high anxious. We need to identify conditions of appropriate and inappropriate use of video feedback.

Social-Communicative Anxiety

To make manageable a discussion of the different but related conceptualizations of communication anxiety/avoidance problems, I shall intend "social-communicative anxiety" as an inclusive label (Daly, 1978; Daly & Stafford, 1984). The reader is referred elsewhere for descriptions of the various conceptualizations of the problems: communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1970, 1934), reticence (Phillips, 1968, 1984), shyness (Buss, 1984, Zimbardo, 1977, 1982), social anxiety (Leary, 1983), unwillingness to communicate (Burgoon, 1976), audience anxiety (Daly & Buss, 1984), stage fright (Clevenger, 1959), social reticence (Jones & Russell, 1982), social-communicative anxiety (Daly, 1978; Daly & Stafford, 1984), and unassertiveness (Adler, 1977; Lazarus, 1973). Although they differ, each of these conceptualizations recognize the inhibiting presence of anxiety. With communication apprehension, for example, anxiety is the problem. However, with reticence and unassertiveness, lack of communication skills rather than anxiety is seen as the primary problem.

Although speaking only of communication apprehension, McCroskey's (1982, 1984) description of an anxiety continuum reveals that we are working with a range of experienced anxiety. He suggested that for some (a) the

anxiety is relatively enduring and is present regardless of context, reciever, or time (trait-like anxiety), for others (b) the anxiety is also relatively enduring but occurs only in certain communication contexts regardless of receiver or time (generalized anxiety), still others (c) consistently experience anxiety only when communicating with specific people (person-group anxiety), and finally others (d) experience a transitory anxiety when communicating with a specific receiver at a specific time (situational anxiety).

Most of the research on communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1977) and on most of the other conceptualizations of social-communicative anxiety (Daly & Stafford, 1984) have focused on trait anxiety. The result, of course, is that we have a better understanding of trait anxiety consequences for communicators than of transitory anxiety. It is possible for example, that those already disposed to anxiety might also experience reactive anxiety (a transitory anxiety) when confronted with the video camera. Some students with low trait anxiety might also experience reactive anxiety in the same situation but are likely to bring the anxiety under control. High trait anxious, who already have little expectation of success with the communication assignment, could experience a further decrement in performance caused by the elevated physiological arousal of reactive anxiety. The communication literature offers little guidance here but the communication problem intensification arising from reactive anxiety is a disquieting possibility. An analogous situation would be the highly anxious child receiving emergency medical treatment who becomes hysterical at the sight of a person in a surgical mask (reactive anxiety). The child might have been able to endure the frightening treatment if reactive anxiety could have been avoided.

Clevenger (1959, 1984) reminds us that there are three anxiety response domains--cognitive, behavioral, and physiological. Cognitive responses revealing anxiety include expressed expectations of being uncomfortable or

inept while communicating. Behavioral responses include such overt manifestations of anxiety as bodily tension, disfluencies, and nervous actions. Physiological responses include accelerated heart rates, sweating, and changes in skin temperature which alert the person that "something is wrong." Later we will consider how each response domain might affect success or failure when using video in the classroom.

Characteristics of social-communicative anxiety

Reviews of causes and consequences of social-communicative anxiety are available elsewhere (see Daly & McCroskey, 1984, for review; and Payne & Richmond, 1984, for bibliography). Here we will focus only on those characteristics which suggest potential reactivity to video feedback.

Evaluation Anxiety. While many people seek evaluation even when it produces arousal, there are some who are seriously handicapped by anticipated evaluation. Apparently in each of the conceptions of social-communicative anxiety, anxiety arises, at least in part, from self or other evaluation of anticipated or actual communication. In fact the anxious are likely to be excessively preoccupied with evaluation (Leavy, 1980; Smith, Ingram, & Brehm, 1983; Watson & Friend, 1969). Phillips (1984) found that most reticents fear that others will evaluate them as "stupid fools". Fear of disapproval was found to be related to unassertiveness (Lefeure & West, 1981). Zimbardo describes the shy person as one who sees himself/herself as a performer "surrounded by an audience of overly eager critics" (1982, p. 468). Buss (1984) concluded that being the subject of focused social attention (evaluation) is aversive for the shy. At least for the shy, unrealistically high performance standards are held so one either avoids situations leading to evaluation or engages in self-debasement to prevent evaluation (Zimbardo, 1982). Development of low self-esteem can be the consequence.

Self-Esteem. Daly and Stafford concluded in their review of research that "regardless of how either anxiety or esteem is operationalized, the inverse relationship holds" (1984, p. 132). A negative anxiety-esteem relationship is not surprising, but is particularly troubling when consequences of low self-esteem are considered in a later section.

Accuracy of Self-Perceptions. Video feedback often requires the student to engage in self-evaluation either alone or assisted by in tructor and/or classmates. Phillips (1984) argued that we need to persuade the reticent student that he/she is improving. Findings that anxious students engage in negative distortions of self-perception (Arkin, Appelman, & Burger, 1980; Burgio, Glass, & Merluzzi, 1981; Clark & Arkowitz, 1975; Curran, Wallander, & Fischetti, 1980; Gilkinson, 1943; Smith & Sarason, 1975; Teglasi & Hoffman, 1982; Trower, O'Mahony, & Dryden, 1982) suggest that video self-confrontation could intensify anxiety by reinforcing self-perceptions of failure. Negative self-perceptions might also lead to rejection of the video playback as evidence of skill improvement. Unfortunately, there is some tendency to attend to evidence of failure and to avoid evidence of success thus reinforcing the anxiety.

Self-Disclosure. The anxious seem reluctant to self-disclose and are less skilled in disclosure (Hamilton, 1972; McCroskey & Richmond, 1977; Miller, Berg, & Archer, 1983; Morris, Harris, & Rovins, 1981; Stacks & Stone, 1983; Wheeless, Nesser, & McCroskey, 1976). What self-disclosure is offered also tends to be more negative (Bradac, Tardy, & Hosman, 1980). To the extent that participation in videotaped assignments and self-evaluation of video feedback requires self-disclosure, the anxious could experience difficulty.

Less Positive Relationship with Teacher. Effective teachers--especially those with whom one has good relationships--can ameliorate many unpleasant or

frightening classroom experiences. Limited evidence suggests that high communication apprehensives perceive teachers to be less friendly, immediate, and open (Andersen, 1979) and teachers have less positive regard for the anxious student (McCroskey & Daly, 1976; Powers & Dunathan, 1978; Symthe and Powers, 1978). One might expect that if anxious students felt free to discuss feelings about assignments that at least reactive anxiety concerning class activities might be reduced.

The Anxious Student in the Communication Class

The high anxious student compared to low anxious students has been found to have high drop-out rates, to receive lower grades on communication performances, to talk less in class, to participate less and to exert less leadership during small group discussions, to be less attractive to classmates and to have a less satisfying relationship with the instructor (Daly & Stafford, 1984; Richmond, 1984). Beyond these, we have little knowledge of what conventional basic communication courses with communication performance and skill development expectations "do" to students with high social-communicative anxiety.

Specifically, we need to learn whether a high anxious student drops the class only because of low expectation of success or because the class intensifies anxiety, further reduces expectations of success as a communicator, and further depresses self-esteem. If the latter possibilities are true, this means that attempts to "mainstream" these students in conventional classes leaves them much worse than we found them. In many instances the anxious student has inadequate communication skills so it is not surprising that he/she receives lower grades on performance assignments. The critical question is not whether the anxious student becomes as successful as the less anxious in a single course but whether the anxious actually improves and recognizes improvement in communication skills. If there is no

recognition of improvement, we could be harming rather than helping the anxious student.

Stacks and Stone (1983) report the most relevant study of what a conventional basic course does to high communication apprehensive students. They found that self-reported apprehensiveness significantly declined but still remained one standard deviation above the class mean for students in public speaking and small group communication classes. Self-reported apprehensiveness for students in interpersonal communication classes did not significantly improve. It is unclear how a 32% drop-out and data loss rate affected the analysis. In conclusion, these students remained high apprehensives but, at least, did not experience an increase in apprehensiveness.

If we find studies of communication classes in which students became less effective as the result of instruction, we might wonder whether anxiety was present. No study revealing a serious loss of effectiveness resulting from instruction was found.

Finally, we might expect that high anxious students might suffer a decline in self-concept as a communicator if the basic course instruction was too intimidating. Although neither measured student anxiety, McCroskey (1967) found that the basic course increased confidence in speaking ability and Furr (1970) found that self-concept increased more in a business speaking course than in psychology and physical education courses. Brooks and Platz (1968) found that self-concept as a communicator improved for 75% and declined for 25% of the students in a basic course. They speculated that decline was due to discovery of shortcomings as a communicator. It is impossible to determine whether this discovery was beneficial or harmful to the students.

Although the communication anxiety literature suggests that continuation in the basic course could be a punishing experience for the high anxious, the

literature does not permit confirmation of these speculations. Obviously we need more research on the fate of these students in our classes. Knowledge of what we do to these students is especially critical because it appears that most of us do not offer special treatment programs. They sink or swim in our classes.

Video Feedback Effects

Among the video uses in communication and other classes from elementary school to college and adult training are the videotaping of speeches, scenes from drama, sales presentations, parenting role plays, dyadic interpersonal communication, interviews, small group exercises, conflict management role plays, and role played responses to angry customers. Typically, video feedback is offered in one of two forms. (1) The student or trainee views the videotape privately. The feedback may or may not be structured by instructions about what to observe in the videotaped performance. (2) The student or trainee shares the self-viewing with an instructor and/or classmates. The student, instructor, and classmates may or may not offer an oral or written critique of the videotaped performance.

Reactivity to Video Feedback

Many people are probably curious about how they appear on television so it might be difficult to anticipate that some could perceive videotaping as aversive. In fact, one group of first grade students improved phonics skills in exchange for an opportunity to be seen by classmates solving math problems on television (Gross, Thurman, & Drabman, 1980).

Any reactive anxiety to video use could arise, in part, from the novelty of the medium. Novelty, formality, and conspicuousness of speaker

are said to be among the causes of audience anxiety, a transitory anxiety (Daly & Buss, 1984). One can expect that for most students the video camera is still novel. Because of time constraints many instructors only use video feedback once or twice during the course so novelty reactions are never extinguished. In addition, performance before a camera which produces a permanent record probably increases the perception of formality. Being the focus of attention of both the camera and the class during the performance and the focus of evaluative attention during playback probably increases a feeling of conspicuousness. Therefore, it is possible that video could intensify audience anxiety.

Other relevant evidence of arousal effects of video is often anecdotal and inconsistent. Several reports suggest that video use in the classroom did not significantly elevate anxiety (Bush, Bittner, & Brooks, 1972; Fiedler & Beach, 1979; Horan, Hair, & Warner, 1973; Lake & Adams, 1984; Lyons, Bradley, & White, 1984). In addition, videotape use in speech classes reduced non-fluencies (a possible index of anxiety) (Deihl, Breen, & Larson, 1970), increased attendance (Goldhaber & Klein, 1972), and produced favorable attitudes toward video feedback (Caton & Feather, 1965; Henderson, 1964).

Yet, there are teachers and therapists who have expressed concern about observed anxiety reactions to video. Hirschfeld wrote, "Those of us who have seen ourselves on film and TV are not surprised at student descriptions of the experience as 'shattering' and 'shocking'. Some sensitive (anxious?) students react with real despair, sometimes only partially mitigated by seeing that they are not much worse than their classmates" (1968, p. 118). A therapist suggested that video can be disturbing to patients because the video record is so detailed, elicits stronger reactions than other patient records, and might be permanent. "Patients may have the feeling that their

actions will never die" (Johnson, 1981, p. 307). Hosford and Mills (1983) reviewed evidence suggesting that video feedback can be strongly emotionally arousing. In a study of hospitalized patients, 77% experienced anxiety during initial video feedback. Seventeen percent offered such immediate negative self-descriptions as "disgusting, sickening, and heartbreaking" (Reivich & Geertsma, 1968, cited in Berger, 1978).

Findings that general populations and even experienced communicators can react negatively to video feedback should cause one to hesitate to use it when anxious students might be in the class. For example, Nussbaum's (1984) experience is interesting. Of 61 graduate teaching assistants (experienced communicators) asked to participate in a study of teaching effectiveness, only 31 agreed to participate. It is not surprising that so many of the TA's would be reluctant to have their teaching evaluated. What is surprising is that of the 31 who were willing to be evaluated, only 11 would agree to have their teaching performance videotaped. Did those 20 students fear the videotaping experience? Did they fear that the video would reveal more than they wanted revealed? Others have found that teachers experienced excessive anxiety when video feedback was employed (Perlberg, Peri, Weinreb, Nitzan, Shimron, & O'Bryant, 1971; Stewart & Stewart, 1970). Studies of other general populations have also found that video playback can be stressful (Holtzman, 1969; Kagan & Krathwohl, 1967: Logue, Zenner, & Gohman, 1968; Neilsen, 1964).

In a review of the use of video and other methods of self-confrontation in teacher training, Fuller and Manning (1973) concluded that YAVIS (young, attractive, verbal, intelligent, and successful) types could benefit, but HOUNDS (homely, old, unattractive, non-verbal, and dumb) might become victims.

Undoubtedly, video feedback will be more productive with some students than with others. Useful conclusions about the potential reactivity of video feedback is, however, impossible. Those who reported no stress increases with video use collected data from classes in which significant numbers of high anxious students might not have been enrolled. For example, Lake and Adams (1984) used high school classes which had entirely elective enrollments. In the studies in which anxiety might have been normally distributed, communication anxiety levels were never variables so we are unsure of the responses of the anxious to the camera. On the other hand, studies revealing anxiety responses to video did not eliminate such alternative explanations that teachers and others were responding to the prospect of evaluation rather than to the use of video. When we are uncertain about student response, however, we should use video feedback carefully. We need to be alert to the possibility that some will experience excessive anxiety which interferes with instruction.

Consequences of Video Feedback

Although the evidence of video reactivity is not compelling, it should raise questions about possible hazards of video use with anxious students. Potential hazards might arise from this surge of reactive anxiety, or they might arise from such features as the self-confrontational nature of video feedback. Is video feedback potentially harmful to our anxious students?

In fact, several recent studies found that video feedback was no better than verbal feedback in instruction and therapy (Brenes & Cooklin, 1983; Brown, 1980; Hanser & Furman, 1980; Padgett, 1983; Thelen & Lasoski, 1980). It neither helped nor harmed people. Others have found positive video feedback effects when used to improve speech delivery (Deihl, Breen, & Larson, 1970; Nelson, 1968; Ochs, 1968; Marshall, Parker, & Hayes, 1982; Porter & King, 1972), to develop communication instructional skills

(Elliott & Smith, 1975; MacLeod, 1977), to develop clinical interview skills (Hosford & Johnson, 1983), to develop selected interpersonal communication skills (Archer & Kagan, 1973; Edelson & Seidman, 1975; Hartson & Kunch, 1973), to develop small group communication skills (Gerszewski, 1972; Walter, 1978), and to develop social skills (see Hung & Rosenthal, 1981, for review). None of these studies reveal whether high anxious subjects are included so it is impossible to determine whether social-communicative anxious students also improved as the result of video feedback.

There is a body of research and case studies--mostly with clinical populations--which suggest that video feedback can have undesirable outcomes (see Bailey & Sowder, 1970; Griffiths, 1974; Hung & Rosenthal, 1981; Trower & Kiely, 1983, for reviews). Descriptions of those debilitated by social-communicative anxiety suggest that they share some of the vulnerabilities of clinical populations. As noted earlier, the social-communicative anxious is often characterized by excessive fear of evaluation, irrational beliefs about being the focus of attention, low self-esteem, negative expectations of success, inability to accept success evaluation, tendency to negatively interpret one's actions, and unwillingness/inability to self-disclose. Although they may have additional problems or more intense manifestations of problems, many of those who seek therapy for marital, career and emotional problems share characteristics of the social-communicative anxious person.

Trower and Kiely (1983) cited research which suggested that video feedback provoked anxiety, worsened patient's symptoms, increased the likelihood of self-blame in marital therapy, resulted in suicides and separations in marital therapy, reduced self-esteem of alcoholics, and reduced self-efficacy expectations. In one instance, video feedback drove alcoholics to drink more (Schaefer, Sobell, & Sobell, 1972). McRea (1983) also cited

studies which suggested that video feedback reduced positiveness of self-descriptions, increased anxiety, caused discontinuation of therapy, and led to suicide. Renne, Dowrick, and Wasek (1983) warned that use of video with shy people is likely to intensify shyness.

A major reason for using video feedback is that it offers concrete, detailed information about one's performance. It is, however, not an objective report because it is interpreted by those who view it (Johnson, 1981; Trower & Kiely, 1983). Each of us are disposed to see the evidence in his/her own way. Social-communicative anxious and depressed people, for example, both are likely to have low self-esteem, to make many negative self-statements, and to interpret information about the self--even positive information--negatively. Video feedback which was expected to concretely reveal personal success to depressed women in therapy actually increased their negative self-images (Biggs, Rosen & Summerfield, 1980). These researchers warned against future video feedback with depressed people. Similarly, Bandura (1977) concluded that video feedback, instead of helping patients see themselves as competent and in control, is likely to reduce self-efficacy expectations. High anxious-high social skill subjects underestimated their skills while viewing a videotape of themselves in a dating simulation (Curran, Wallander, & Fischetti, 1980).

In addition to self-distortions of the video record, it is possible for the camera to distort--a distortion potentially troubling for those with low self-esteem. Johnson observed that "cameras do not always tell the truth. They tell truly, of course, what they see; but they don't always see the truth. Perhaps the expression on that person's face would look rather different from another angle" (1981, p. 309). Further distortion might be caused when a person giving a speech tries to communicate to and stay within

the range of the camera. Resulting playback might seem to show unresponsiveness to the audience and failure to move (stiffness). This could reinforce negative attributions of those who already perceive a large actual behavior-ideal performance discrepancy. During a videotaped small group discussion a person might be caught by the camera displaying agitation or confusion because he/she is trying to remember information to contribute to the discussion. The video record presents the agitation "under" the voice of another group member who is speaking. It appears that the person is reacting to the speaker. The shy or anxious person who already fears that others are constantly judging the appropriateness of his/her behavior is likely to be appalled by the obvious interpretation and further withdraw in class.

Video magnification of nervous or off-task behavior is a related problem. Unless people are trained to ignore appearance and behavior (especially delivery), self-viewers are likely to focus on these aspects of the performance (Bock, Powell, Kitchens, & Flavin, 1977; Fuller & Baker, 1970; Hirschfeld, 1968; Salomon & McDonald, 1970). Although others may never notice certain behavior or attribute no significance to it, the anxious student may be shocked by the number of vocalized pauses and by the nervous wringing of hands. At least two attributions might follow. (1) This magnified behavior reinforces negative self-perceptions as a communicator. (2) He/she believes that others also recognize and judge the behavior to be evidence of incompetence. Now the student has more to worry about in future performances.

Several theorists have commented on the tendency to separate the self into the private, unshared domain (emotions, self-perceptions) and the public, observable domain. Trower and Kiely (1983) suggest that video feedback makes a person feel transparent. While watching the video record, a person recognizes the emotion which caused an observable behavior.

Suddenly, the person reaches the unwarranted conclusion that others can also see the emotion as well as the behavior. The private domain has painfully become public. In Goffman's (1969) terms, the back regions of a performance have been exposed. Trower and Kiely contend that this exposure can be harmful to shy people and to others who are very self-conscious.

In summary, the social-communicative anxious person who probably fears evaluation has poor self-esteem, has inaccurate (usually more negative) self-perceptions, and is reluctant to self-disclose is likely to find the video self-confrontation to be too intense, to reinforce negative self-perceptions, to lower self-esteem, to cause embarrassing self-consciousness, and, in general, to intensify anxiety. These possible consequences of intense self-focus could perpetuate the cycle of anxiety, communication avoidance, and inadequate communication. The problem is compounded because the anxious student does not perceive the instructor to be approachable and the instructor is unlikely to have a high positive regard for the anxious student (McCroskey & Daly, 1976, Powers & Dunathan, 1978; Smythe & Powers, 1978). An unsympathetic or insensitive handling of in-class video feedback might be devastating to some students.

Research Implications

1. A better understanding of how we affect anxious students in the classroom could result from a specific identification of why they drop-out. It is not enough to assume that they dropped because they did not expect to succeed. Why did they enroll in the first place? We might find that certain class activities or instructional practices prompted withdrawal.
2. We know that the anxious receive lower grades on communication assignments, but do they improve their communication skills in

3. Do video feedback and other potentially anxiety-inducing instructional and evaluation practices substantially increase transitory anxiety of either high or low anxious students?
4. If video feedback induces excessive anxiety, how are high anxious students affected? Are they likely to experience increased communication anxiety, loss of self-esteem, etc.?
5. Treatment programs and special class sections appear to help the anxious students. Unfortunately, resources often do not allow special programs at most schools and colleges. Can instructors modify instructional practices to successfully "mainstream" anxious students in regular communication classes? What instructional modifications must be made? In which courses is "mainstreaming" most likely to be successful?
4. We need better designed studies to confirm/modify the guidelines for video feedback offered below.

Guidelines for Video Feedback

Several useful suggestions for video feedback which could apply to any course have emerged from the research. It is not clear whether these will enable the anxious student to cope more successfully with video feedback. For the anxious student, these methods are probably better than "Today we are going to see what we look like on video" and "Now do you see what you are doing wrong" approaches to video feedback.

1. Some success for self-modeling has been reported (Dowrick, 1983; Hosford & Johnson, 1983). In self-modeling, instances of inappropriate behavior are edited out before video feedback. During self-viewing the person is more likely to see him/herself behaving competently and is more likely to maintain the

appropriate behavior.

2. Although not a feedback method, video models of others performing the communication or social skill can aid skill development (Heilveil, 1983; Hosford & Mills, 1983; Walter, 1984). For anxious students, models who display coping skills and who are rewarded by others for their behavior probably are most effective (Hosford & Mills, 1983).
3. Students should be prepared for videotaping and for the video playback. They should know what to expect and what to observe during the replay (Hosford & Mills, 1983).
4. Usually focused feedback is more effective than unstructured self-viewing (Hosford & Mills, 1983). That is, discussion of the performance should accompany the video replay.
5. Use several videotaped exercises to reduce novelty effects. This might enable students to become more comfortable and to move beyond a focus on personal appearance.

Adler, R.B. (1977). Confidence in communication: A guide to assertive and social skills. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Anderson, J.F. (1979). Perceptions of immediacy and communicator style as altered by communication apprehension level. Paper presented at Western Speech Communication Association convention, Los Angeles.

Archer, J., & Kagan, N. (1973). Teaching interpersonal relationship skills on campus: A pyramid approach. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 535-540.

Arkin, R.M., Appelman, A.J., & Burger, M.M. (1980). Social anxiety, self-presentation, and the self-serving bias in causal attribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 23-25.

Bailey, K., & Sowder, W.T. (1970). Audiotape and videotape self-confrontation in psychotherapy. Psychological Bulletin, 74, 127-137.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Berger, H.B. (1978). Confrontation through videotape. In M.B. Berger (Ed.). Videotape Techniques in Psychiatric Training and Treatment (rev. ed.) (pp. 19-36). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Biggs, S.J., Rosen. B., & Summerfield, A.B. (1980). Video feedback and personal attribution in anorexic, depressed and normal viewers. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 53, 249-254.

Bock,D.G., Powell, L., Kitchens, J.T., & Flavin, J.W. (1977). The influence of sex differences in speech evaluation: Situational and media effects. Communication Education, 26, 143-153.

Bradac, J.J., Tardy, C.H., & Hosman, L.A. (1980). Disclosure styles and a hint at their genesis. Human Communication Research, 6, 228-238.

Brenes, A., & Cooklin, A.I. (1983). Videotape feedback effects in interpersonal perception accuracy in families undergoing therapy. Journal of Psychiatric Treatment & Evaluation, 5, 345-352.

Brooks, W.D., & Platz, S.M. (1968). The effects of speech training upon self-concept as a communicator. Speech Teacher, 17, 44-49.

Brown, S.D. (1980). Video-tape feedback: Effects on assertive performance and subjects' perceived competence and satisfaction. Psychological Reports, 47, 455-461.

Burgin, K.L., Glass, C.R., & Merluzzi, T.V. (1981). The effects of social anxiety and videotape performance feedback on cognitions and self-evaluations. Behavioral Counseling Quarterly, 1, 288-301.

Burgoon, J.K. (1976). The unwillingness-to-communicate scale: Development and validation. Communication Monographs, 42, 60-69.

Bush, J.D., Bittner, J.R., & Brooks, W.D. (1972). The effect of the videotape recorder on levels of anxiety, exhibitionism, and reticence. Speech Teacher, 21, 127-130.

Buss, A.H. (1984). A conception of shyness. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.). Avoiding Communication (pp. 39-50). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Caton, C.F., & Feather, G.K. (1965). Teaching speech with television. NAEB Journal, 24, 24-26.

Clark, J.V., & Arkowitz, H. (1975). Social anxiety and self-evaluation of interpersonal performance. Psychological Reports, 36, 211-221.

Clevenger, T., Jr. (1959). A synthesis of experimental research in stage fright. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45, 134-145.

Clevenger, T., Jr. (1984). An analysis of research on the social anxieties. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.). Avoiding communication (pp. 219-236). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Curran, J.P., Wallander, J.L., & Fischetti, M. (1980). The importance of behavioral and cognitive factors in heterosexual social anxiety. Journal of Personality, 48, 285-298.

Daly, J.A. (1978). The assessment of social-communicative anxiety via self-reports: A comparison of measures. Communication Monographs, 45, 204-218.

Daly, J.A., & Buss, A.H. (1984). The transitory causes of audience anxiety. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.). Avoiding communication (pp. 67-78). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Daly, J.A., & McCroskey, J.C. (Eds.) (1984) Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Daly, J.A., & Stafford, L. (1984). Correlates and consequences of social-communicative anxiety. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding Communication (pp. 125-144). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Deihl, E.R., Breen, M.P., & Larson, C.V. (1970). The effects of teacher comment and television video-tape playback on the frequency of nonfluency in beginning speech students. Speech Teacher, 19, 185-189.

Dowrick, P.W. (1983), Self-modelling. In P.W. Dowrick & S.J. Biggs (Eds). Using video (pp. 105-124), Chichester: John Wiley.

Edelson, R.I., Seidman, E. (1975). Use of videotaped feedback in altering interpersonal perceptions of married couples: A therapy analogue. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 43,244-250.

Elliott, L.E., & Smith, E.P. (1975). Improving performance of classroom teachers through videotaping and self-evaluation. AV Communication Review, 23, 277-288.

Fiedler, K.M., & Beach, B.L. (1979, January). Future dieticians learn counseling skills through microteaching. Educational and Industrial Television, 11, 40-41.

Foss, K.A. (1982). Communication apprehension: Resources for the instructor. Communication Education, 31, 195-203.

Fuller, F.F., & Baker, H.P. (1970). Counseling Teachers: Using video feedback of their teaching Behavior. The Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.

Fuller, F.F., & Manning, B.A. (1973). Self-confrontation reviewed: A conceptualization for video feedback in teacher education. Review of Educational Research, 43, 469-528.

Furr, H.B. (1970). Influences of a course in speech communication on self-concept of college freshmen. Speech Teacher, 19, 26-31.

Gerszewski, M.C. (1972). The effects of focused videotape feedback upon group expressions of warmth, hostility, and flight. Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of North Dakota.

Gilkinson, H. (1943). A questionnaire study of the causes of social fears among college speech students. Speech Monographs, 10, 74-83.

Goffman, E. (1969). The presentation of self in everyday life. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Goldhaber, G.M., & Kline, J.A. (1972). Effects of videotape on attendance and attitudes in the fundamentals of speech communication course. Speech Teacher, 21, 93-98.

Griffiths, R.D.P. (1974). Videotaped feedback as a therapeutic technique: Retrospect and prospect. Behavior Research and Therapy, 12, 1-8.

Gross, A.M., Thurman, C., & Drabman, R.S. (1980). The teaching reinforcer: Increasing phonics performance using contingent videotaping. Child Behavior Therapy, 2, 67-72.

Hamilton, P.R. (1972). The effect of risk proneness on small group interaction, communication apprehension, and self-disclosure. Unpublished master's thesis, Illinois State University.

Hanser, S., & Furman, C.E. (1980). The effect of videotape-based feedback on the development of applied clinical skills. Journal of Music Therapy, 17, 103-112.

Hartson, D.J., & Kunce, J.T. (1973). Videotape replay and recall in group work. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 437-441.

Heilveil, I. (1983). Video in mental health practice: An activities Handbook. New York: Springer.

Henderson, J. (1964). Using mirror TV to teach speaking. NAEB Journal, 23.

Hirschfeld, A.G. (1968). Videotape recordings for self-analysis in the speech classroom. Speech Teacher, 17, 116-118.

Hoffman, J., & Sprague, J. (1982). A survey of reticence and communication apprehension treatment programs at U.S. colleges and universities. Communication Education, 31, 185-193.

Holzman, P.S. (1969). On hearing and seeing oneself. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 148, 198-209.

Horan, J.J., Harr, E.L., & Warner, R.W. (1973). Effects of audio and video monitoring on interviewer discomfort. Journal of Employment Counseling, 10, 40-43.

Hosford, R.E., & Johnson, M.E. (1983). A comparison of self-observation, self-modeling, and practice without video feedback for improving counselor interviewing behaviors. Counselor Education & Supervision, 23, 62-70.

Hosford, R.E., & Mills, M.E. (1983). Video in social skills training. In P.W. Dowrick & S.J. Biggs (Eds.). Using Video (pp. 125-150). Chichester: John Wiley.

Hulse, S.H., Deese, J., & Egeth. (1975). The psychology of learning (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hung, J.H., & Rosenthal, T.L. (1981). Therapeutic videotaped playback. In J.L. Fryrear & B. Fleshman (Eds.) Videotherapy in mental health (pp. 5-45). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Johnson, E. (1981). Invidious mirror? Ethical problems in the use of videorecording. In J.L. Fryrear & B. Fleshman (Eds.). Videotherapy in mental health (pp.305-316). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Jones, W.H., & Russell, D.W. (1982). The social reticence scale: A measure of shyness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 629-631.

Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1980). Models of teaching (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kagan, N., & Krathwohl, D.R. (1967). Studies in human interaction: Interpersonal process recall stimulated by videotape. (Report no. OE-7-32-04110-270). Michigan State Univ. (ERIC document no. ED 017 946).

Krohne, H., & Laux, L. (Eds.). (1982). Achievement, stress, and anxiety. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.

Lake, R.L., & Adams, W.C. (1984). Effects of the videotape recorder on levels of anxiety, exhabitionism, and reticence in high school speech students. Communication Education, 33, 333-336.

Lazarus, A.A. (1973). On assertive behavior: A brief note. Behavior Theraphy, 4, 697-699.

Leary, M.R. (1983). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. Journal of Personality Assessment, 47, 65-75.

Lefevre, E.R., & West, M.L. (1981). Assertiveness: Correlations with self-esteem, locus of control, interpersonal anxiety, fear of disapproval, and depression. Psychiatric Journal of the University or Ottawa, 6, 247-251.

Logue, P.E., Zenner, M., Gohman, G. (1964). Video-tape role playing in the job interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15, 436-438.

Lyons, M.J., Bradley, C., & White, J. (1984). Videotaping and abnormal psychology: Dramatized clinical interviews. Teaching of Psychology, 11, 41-42.

MacLeod, G.A. (1977). Descriptive study of students' perceptions of their microteaching performance. In D. MacIntyre, G. MacLeod, & R. Griffiths (eds). Investigations of Microteaching (pp. 194-205). London: Croom Helm.

MacRea, C. (1983). Impact on body-image. In P.W. Dowrick & S.J. Biggs (Eds.). Using Video (pp. 95-103). Chichester: John Wiley.

Marshall, W.L., Parker, L., & Hayes, B.J. (1982). Treating public speaking problems: A study using flooding and the elements of skills training. Behavior Modification, 6, 147-170.

McCroskey, J.C. (1967). The effects of the basic speech course on students' attitudes. Speech Teacher, 16, 115-117.

McCroskey, J.C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 37, 269-277.

McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 4, 78-96.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982). Oral communication apprehension: A reconceptualization. Communication Yearbook, 6, 136-170.

McCroskey, J.C. (1984). The communication apprehension perspective. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.). Avoiding communication (pp. 13-38). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J.C., & Daly, J.A. (1976). Teachers' expectations of the communication apprehensive child in the elementary school. Human Communication Research, 3, 67-72.

McCroskey, J.C., & Richmond, V.P. (1978). Communication apprehension as a predictor of self-disclosure. Communication Quarterly, 25, 40-43.

Miller, L., Berg, J.H. & Archer, R.L. Openers: Individuals who elicit intimate self disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1234-1244.

Morris, L.W., Harris, E.W., & Rovins, D.S. (1981). Interactive effects of generalized and situational expectancies on the arousal of congnitive, and emotional components of social anxiety. Journal of Research in Personality, 15, 302-311.

Nelson, H.E. (1968). Videotaping the speech course. Speech Teacher, 17 101-103.

Nielsen, G. (1964). Studies in self confrontation. Cleveland: Howard Allen.

Nussbaum, J. (1984). Classroom behavior of the effective teacher. Communication: Journal of CAP, 13, 81-91.

Ochs, D.J. (1968). Videotape in teaching advanced public speaking. Speech Teacher, 17, 110-112.

Padgett, V.R. (1983). Videotape replay in marital therapy. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 20, 232-242.

Payne, S.K., & Richmond, V.P. A bibliography of related research and theory. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.). Avoiding communication (pp. 247-294). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Perlberg, A., Peri, J.N., Weinreb, M., Nitzan, E., Shimron, J., & O'Bryant, D. (1971). Studies on the use of video-tape recordings and micro-teaching techniques to improve university teaching. Paper at American Educ. Research Assn. convention.

Phillips, G.A. (1968). Reticence: Pathology of the normal speaker. Speech Monographs, 35, 39-49.

Phillips, G.M. (1984). Reticence: A perspective on social withdrawal. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension (pp. 51-66). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Porter, D.T., & King, G.W. (1972). The use of video-tape equipment in improving oral interpretation performance. Speech Teacher, 21, 99-106.

Powers, W.G., & Dunathan, A.T. Student teacher success expectancies for communication apprehensive students. Paper presented at International Communication Association convention, Chicago.

Reivich, R.S., & Geertsma, R.H. (1968). Experiences with videotape self-observation by psychiatric in-patients. Journal of Kansas Medical Society, 69, 39-44.

Rene, C.W., Dowrick, P.W., & Wasek, G. (1983). Considerations of the participant in video recording. In P.W. Dowrick & S.J. Biggs (Eds). Using Video (pp 23-32). Chichester: John Wiley.

Richmond, V.P. (1984). Implications of quietness: Some facts and speculations. In J.A. Daly and J.C. McCroskey (Eds.). Avoiding Communication (p. 145-156). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Salamon, G., & McDonald, F.J. (1970). Pretest and posttest reactions to self-viewing one's teaching performance on video tape. Journal of educational psychology, 61 (4,pt.1), 280-286.

Schaefer, H.H., Sobell, M.B., & Sobell, L.C. (1972). Twelve month follow-up of hospitalized alcoholics given self-confrontation experiences by videotape. Behavior Therapy, 3, 283-285.

Smith, R.E., & Sarason I.G. (1975). Social anxiety and the evaluation of negative interpersonal feedback. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 429.

Smith, T.W., Ingram, R.E., & Brehm, S.S. (1983). Social anxiety, anxious self-perceptions, and recall of self relevant information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1276-1283.

Smythe, M-J., & Powers, W.G. (1978). When galatea is apprehensive: The effect of communication apprehension on teacher expectations. Communication Yearbook, 2.

Stacks, D., & Stone, J.D. (1983). The effect of self-concept, self-disclosure, and type of basic speech course on communication apprehension. Communication: Journal of the CAP, 23, 205-128.

Stewart, M.S., & Stewart, D.S. (1970). Teacher, teach yourself. Audiovisual Instruction, 15, 26-27.

Teglasi, H., Hoffman, M.A. (1982). Causal attributions of shy subjects. Journal of Research in Personality, 16, 376-385.

Thelen, M.H., & Lasoski, M.C. (1980). The separate and combined effects of focusing information and videotape self-confrontation feedback. Journal of Behavior Therapy & Experimental Psychiatry, 11, 173-178.

Trower, P., & Kiely, B. (1983). Video feedback: Help or hindrance? A Review and analysis. In P.W. Dowrick & S.J. Biggs (Eds.). Using video (pp. 181-197). Chichester: Jon Wiley.

Trower, P., O'Mahony, J.F., & Dryden, W. (1982). Congnitive aspects of social failure: Some implications for social skills training. British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 10, 176-184.

Walter, G. (1984) Effects of videotape and modelling on the behaviors of task group members. In O. Zuber-Skerritt (Ed.). Video in higher education (pp. 142-155). London: Kogan Page.

Watson, D. & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 448-457.

Wheeless, L.R., Nesser, K., & McCroskey, J.C. (1976). The relationship among self-disclosure, disclosiveness, and communication apprehension. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco.

Wittrack, M.C., & Lumsdaine, A.A. (1977). Instructional psychology. Annual Review of Psychology, 28, 417-459.

Zimbardo, P.G. (1977). Shyness: What it is, what to do about it. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Zimbardo, P.G. (1982). Shyness and the stresses of the human connection. In L. Goldberger & Breznitz (Eds.) Handbook of Stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects (pp. 466-481). New York: The Free Press.